


PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number	
		Q76052	
Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Application Number	Filed	
	10/725,432	December 3, 2003	
	First Named Inventor		
	Minseok LEE		
	Art Unit	Examiner	
	2141	Djenane M. BAYARD	
WASHINGTON OFFICE <b>23373</b> CUSTOMER NUMBER			
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal			
The review is requested for the reasons(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am an attorney or agent of record.			
Registration number 61,124		 Signature	
		S. Stuart Lee Typed or printed name	
		(202) 293-7060 Telephone number	
		May 5, 2008 Date	

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: Q76052

Minseok LEE, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/725,432

Group Art Unit: 2141

Confirmation No.: 5323

Examiner: Djename M. BAYARD

Filed: December 3, 2003

For: USER INTERFACE CONVERSION SYSTEM AND METHOD CAPABLE OF  
SUPPORTING VARIOUS DEVICES

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

**MAIL STOP AF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, and further to the Examiner's Final Office Action dated February 4, 2008, Applicant files this Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review. This Request is also accompanied by the filing of a Notice of Appeal.

Applicant turns now to the rejections at issue:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0009573 to Wang et al. (hereinafter "Wang").

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable because Wang fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites that an integrated user interface is

generated based on neutral user interfaces of devices residing on a home network and converted into a specific user interface suitable for a specific client of a user.

Wang is directed to a home network 100 of multiple devices including at least one client device (e.g. DTV 102) and at least one server device (e.g. DVCR 110). A browser 200 gathers device information of the devices connected to the home network 100 to generate a top-level user control page 220 (See Figures 5 and 6), wherein each device is represented by a graphical icon reference and a textual name reference extracted from the HTML control page GUI of the device (paragraph 113). A user may click on an icon reference of any of the devices in the top-level user control page 220 to access that particular device's HTML control page GUI (paragraph 114).

In another embodiment, Wang discloses devices 704 in an external network 702 may generate network top-level GUI 1054 to control devices in a home network 300 via a gateway 700 (Figure 7 and paragraph 274). Device 704 may be a remote access device 1052 such as a PC, laptop, PDA, wireless phone etc. (paragraph 273). A remote access device 1052 with low resolution may use a text-only version, while a high-end PC may have a complex graphics interface. The different versions of the network top-level GUI 1054 are generated by gateway 700 (paragraph 287).

The Examiner seems to contend that Wang's network top-level GUI 1054 corresponds to the claimed specific user interface. However, Wang does not teach that an integrated user interface is generated based on neutral user interfaces of devices residing on a home network and converted into a specific user interface suitable for a specific client of a user, as recited in claim

1. Instead, Wang only discloses that the network top-level GUI 1054 is generated to be displayed on the remote access device 1052 (paragraph 274).

Though Wang discloses that a text only version of the network top-level GUI 1054 may be provided for a remote access device 1052 with low resolution capabilities, the text only version would still be generated by the gateway device 702 (paragraph 287). Wang is silent about any conversion of the text only version from any other top-level GUI.

In the “Response to Applicants’ Arguments” section of the Final Office Action dated February 4, 2008, the Examiner responded to the above arguments by asserting that the above recitation of claim 1 is taught and reproduces paragraph 287 of Wang which discloses that “different remote access devices 1052 may have different versions of home network directory page 1054, and customized remote home network interfaces. For example, a hand-held device 1052 with low resolution may use a text only version, while a high-end PC may have a complex graphics interface. These customized HN directories (e.g., home network top level GUI 1054, Home Network Directory Page) can be accommodated using XSL, or the gateway device 702 may generate different versions.”

However, Wang’s disclosure of generating different versions of a top level GUI does not disclose the claimed generating and converting of an integrated user interface. Wang does not teach that the home network top level GUI 1054 is changed into another form. Instead, Wang discloses that a version of the home network top level GUI 1054 is initially created by gateway device 702 depending on the capabilities of hand-held device 1052. No further conversion of this created version of the top-level GUI 1054 from any other previously created version is

taught, suggested, or even contemplated by Wang. Thus, Wang does not teach that an integrated user interface is generated based on neutral user interfaces of devices residing on a home network and converted into a specific user interface suitable for a specific client of a user, as recited in claim 1.

In the Advisory Action dated April 15, 2008, the Examiner merely repeats the “Response to Applicants’ Arguments” set forth in the Final Office Action dated February 4, 2008 without any further arguments. Applicants maintain that Wang’s disclosure of generating different versions of a top level GUI does not disclose the claimed generating and converting of an integrated user interface.

Because Wang does not teach all of the features of claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Wang. Applicants also submit that claims 2-5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Each of independent claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 17 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW  
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/725,432

Q76052

Applicants also submit that claims 8-9, 11-13, 15-16, and 18-20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on one of claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 17.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Stuart Lee', written over a horizontal line.

S. Stuart Lee  
Registration No. 61,124

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 5, 2008